



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/024,668

12/14/2001

Lin Yue

US018204

2944

24737

7590

08/15/2005

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS

P.O. BOX 3001

BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

JAMAL, ALEXANDER

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2643

DATE MAILED: 08/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/024,668

Applicant(s)

YUE, LIN

Examiner

Alexander Jamal

Art Unit

2643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 June 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 17-25 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Based upon the submitted amendment (6-21-2005), the examiner notes that claims 1,2,6,17,18,22 have been amended.
2. Examiner withdraws the 112 second paragraph rejections for claims 1,6,17,22.
3. Examiner withdraws all 103 rejections to all claims and submits a new set of non-final rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. **Claims 10,13-16** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Abrishmakar et al. (6895058).

As per **claim10**, Abrishamkar discloses a wireless system with base and mobile stations (Fig. 1) with a quick page detection method used with paging and quick paging channels (ABSTRACT). The system uses first and second paging symbols (bits) that are

Art Unit: 2643

detected by comparing the page indicators (pilot signal strengths) with a first and second threshold. Fig. 3 discloses Epilot1 and Epilot2 that are compared with first threshold Terasure (steps 106,118) and then are further compared with To/I-combined (step 126). The steps of comparing the pilot signals to thresholds are used to determine if the page indicators (and also the quick page bits) were reliably transmitted.

As per **claim 16**, claim rejected for same reasons as claim 10 rejection.

As per **claims 13,15**, claim rejected for same reasons as claim 10.

As per **claim 14**, Abrishamkar discloses a microprocessor 54 in Fig. 2.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claims 11** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abrishmakar et al. (6895058), and further in view of Gilhousen et al. (6421540).

As per **claim 11**, Abrishmakar discloses applicant's claim 10, but does not specify the timing between the first and second page indicators being separated by at least 20 ms.

Gilhousen discloses a wireless paging system that conforms to the IS-95 standard and its derivatives (col 1 lines 15-65). Gilhousen further discloses that the 1st and 2nd page bits may be spaced 20 ms apart (Col 5 lines 45-65, Col 6 lines 25-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of this application that the quick page bits (and any indicators associated with them) could be spaced 20 ms apart for the purpose of conforming with the known standards.

8. **Claims 12** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abrishmakar et al. (6895058) in view of Gilhousen et al. (6421540) as applied to claim 10.

As per **claim 12**, Abrishmakar and Gilhousen disclose applicant's claims 1,6,10,17,22, but they do not specify running a computer simulation to optimize the first and second page indicators.

Abrishmakar and Gilhousen disclose software based systems that rely on **predetermined** thresholds. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of this application that software simulations could be run as part of the **normal and well known design process** of 'testing a design' for the purpose of verifying and optimizing all parameters of the system before it is put out into final product and made available to the public (an increase in product quality).

Allowable Subject Matter

Art Unit: 2643

9. **Claims 1-9,17-25** are allowed over the prior art of record.

Response to Arguments

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-25 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alexander Jamal whose telephone number is 571-272-7498. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9AM-6PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curtis A Kuntz can be reached on 571-272-7499. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are **571-273-8300** for regular communications and **571-273-8300** for After Final communications.

AJ
August 8, 2005


CURTIS KUNTZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600